

Max–Min Representation of Piecewise Linear Functions

Sergei Ovchinnikov
 Mathematics Department
 San Francisco State University
 San Francisco, CA 94132
 sergei@sfsu.edu

February 1, 2008

Abstract

It is shown that any piecewise linear function can be represented as a Max–Min polynomial of its linear components.

1 Introduction

The goal of the paper is to establish a representation of a piecewise linear function on a closed convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ as a Max–Min composition of its linear components.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce a hyperplane arrangement associated with a given piecewise linear function f on a closed convex domain Γ . This arrangement defines a set $\mathcal{T}$ of regions with closures forming a cover of Γ . A distance function on $\mathcal{T}$ is introduced and its properties are established in Section 3. This distance function is an essential tool in our proof of the main result which is found in Section 4 (Theorem 4.1). Some final remarks are made in Section 5.

The ‘standard’ text on convex polytopes is [2]. More information on hyperplane arrangements is found in [3] and [1].

2 Preliminaries

We begin with the following definition.

Definition 2.1. *Let Γ be a closed convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$. A function $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be piecewise linear if there is a finite family $\mathcal{Q}$ of closed domains such that $\Gamma = \cup \mathcal{Q}$ and f is linear on every domain in $\mathcal{Q}$. A unique linear function g on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which coincides with f on a given $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ is said to be a component of f .*

In this definition, an (affine) linear function is a function in the form

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} + b = a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_dx_d + b.$$

The equation $h(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ defines an (affine) hyperplane provided $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Clearly, any piecewise linear function on Γ is continuous.

Let f be a piecewise linear function on Γ and $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ be the family of its distinct components. In what follows, we assume that f has at least two distinct components.

Since components of f are distinct functions, the solution set of any equation in the form $g_i(\mathbf{x}) = g_j(\mathbf{x})$ for $i < j$ is either empty or a hyperplane. We denote $\mathcal{H}$ the set of hyperplanes defined by the above equations that have a nonempty intersection with the interior $\text{int}(\Gamma)$ of Γ . A simple topological argument shows that $\mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset$; thus $\mathcal{H}$ is an (affine hyperplane) arrangement. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the family of nonempty intersections of the regions of $\mathcal{H}$ with $\text{int}(\Gamma)$. The elements of $\mathcal{T}$ are the connected components of $\text{int}(\Gamma) \setminus \cup \mathcal{H}$. Clearly, they are convex sets. Note that $\cup \mathcal{T}$ is dense in Γ . We shall use the same name ‘region’ for elements of $\mathcal{T}$. The closure $\bar{Q}$ of $Q \in \mathcal{T}$ is the intersection of a polyhedron with Γ . The intersections of facets of this polyhedron with Γ will be also called facets of Q . Two regions in $\mathcal{T}$ are adjacent if the intersection of their closures is a common facet of these regions.

We have the following trivial but important property of $\mathcal{T}$.

Proposition 2.1. *The restrictions of the components of f to any given region $Q \in \mathcal{T}$ are linearly ordered, i.e., for all $i \neq j$, either $g_i(\mathbf{x}) > g_j(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in Q$, or $g_i(\mathbf{x}) < g_j(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in Q$.*

In the rest of the paper, we shall use this property of components without making explicit reference to it.

3 Metric structure on $\mathcal{T}$

We use a straightforward geometric approach to define a distance function on $\mathcal{T}$. It is the same distance function as in [1, Section 4.2] where it is defined as the graph distance on the tope graph.

For given $P, Q \in \mathcal{T}$, let $S(P, Q)$ denote the *separation set* of P and Q , i.e., the set of all hyperplanes in $\mathcal{H}$ separating P and Q .

Let $\mathbf{p} \in P$ and $\mathbf{q} \in Q$ be two points in distinct regions P and Q . Suppose $S(P, Q) = \emptyset$. Then the interval $[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]$ belongs to a connected component of $\text{int}(\Gamma) \setminus \cup \mathcal{H}$ implying $P = Q$, a contradiction. Thus we may assume $S(P, Q) \neq \emptyset$.

The interval $[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]$ is a subset of $\text{int}(\Gamma)$ and has a single point intersection with any hyperplane in $S(P, Q)$. Moreover, we can always choose $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ in such a way that different hyperplanes in $S(P, Q)$ intersect $[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]$ in different points. Let us number these points in the direction from $\mathbf{p}$ to $\mathbf{q}$ as follows

$$\mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{k+1} = \mathbf{q}.$$

Each open interval $(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_{i+1})$ is an intersection of $[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}]$ with some region which we denote R_i (in particular, $R_0 = P$ and $R_k = Q$). Moreover, by means of this construction, points $\mathbf{r}_i$ and $\mathbf{r}_{i+1}$ belong to facets of R_i . We conclude that regions R_i and R_{i+1} are adjacent for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$.

Let us define $d(P, Q) = |S(P, Q)|$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{T}$. It follows from the argument in the foregoing paragraph that the function d satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $d(P, Q) = 0$ if and only if $P = Q$.
- (ii) $d(P, Q) = 1$ if and only if P and Q are adjacent regions.
- (iii) If $d(P, Q) = m$, then there exists a sequence $R_0 = P, R_1, \dots, R_m = Q$ of regions in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $d(R_i, R_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i < m$.

From an obvious relation $S(P, Q) = S(P, R) \Delta S(R, Q)$ it follows that

- (iv) $d(P, Q) \leq d(P, R) + d(R, Q)$, and
- (v) $d(P, Q) = d(P, R) + d(R, Q)$ if and only if $S(P, Q) = S(P, R) \cup S(R, Q)$.

We summarize these properties of d in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *The function $d(P, Q) = |S(P, Q)|$ is a metric on $\mathcal{T}$ satisfying the following properties:*

- (i) $d(P, Q) = 1$ if and only if P and Q are adjacent regions.
- (ii) If $d(P, Q) = m$ then there exists a sequence $R_0 = P, R_1, \dots, R_m = Q$ such that $d(R_i, R_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i < m$.
- (iii) $d(P, Q) = d(P, R) + d(R, Q)$ if and only if $S(P, Q) = S(P, R) \cup S(R, Q)$.

4 Main theorem

In this section, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. (a) *Let f be a piecewise linear function on Γ and $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ be the set of its distinct components. There exists a family $\{S_j\}_{j \in J}$ of subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that*

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{j \in J} \bigwedge_{i \in S_j} g_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma. \quad (1)$$

(b) *Conversely, for any family of distinct linear functions $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ the above formula defines a piecewise linear function.*

Here, $\vee$ and $\wedge$ are operations of maximum and minimum, respectively. The expression on the right side in (1) is a Max–Min (lattice) polynomial in the variables g_i 's.

For a given $P \in \mathcal{T}$ we denote f^P (resp. g_i^P) the restriction of f (resp. g_i) to P . The functions g_i^P are linearly ordered for a fixed P . Since the restriction of f to P is one of the functions g_i^P , there is a unique number $n(P)$ such that $f^P = g_{n(P)}^P$.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists k such that*

$$g_k^P \leq g_{n(P)}^P \quad \text{and} \quad g_k^Q \geq g_{n(Q)}^Q,$$

or, equivalently,

$$g_k(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in P, \quad \text{and} \quad g_k(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in Q.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on $d(P, Q)$.

(i) $d(P, Q) = 1$. By Proposition 3.1 (i), P and Q are adjacent regions. Let F be the common facet of the closures of P and Q and let H be the affine span of F . Since functions $f, g_{n(P)}, g_{n(Q)}$ are continuous, $g_{n(P)}(\mathbf{x}) = g_{n(Q)}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in F$ and therefore for all $\mathbf{x} \in H$. We may assume that $g_{n(P)}^P < g_{n(Q)}^Q$ (the other case is treated similarly). Then $g_{n(P)}^Q > g_{n(Q)}^Q$, and $k = n(P)$ satisfies conditions of the lemma.

(ii) $d(P, Q) > 1$. By Proposition 3.1 (ii) and (i), there is a region R adjacent to P such that $d(R, Q) = d(P, Q) - 1$. By the induction hypothesis, there is r such that

$$g_r^R \leq g_{n(R)}^R \quad \text{and} \quad g_r^Q \geq g_{n(Q)}^Q.$$

If $g_r^P \leq g_{n(P)}^P$, then $k = r$ satisfies conditions of the lemma. Otherwise, we have $g_r^P > g_{n(P)}^P$. By Proposition 3.1 (iii), the unique hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{H}$ that separates P and R also separates P and Q . The same argument as in (i) shows that $g_{n(P)}(\mathbf{x}) = g_{n(R)}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in H$. Since $g_r^P > g_{n(P)}^P$ and $g_r^R \leq g_{n(R)}^R$, we have $g_r(\mathbf{x}) = g_{n(P)}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in H$. Consider function $g = g_r - g_{n(P)}$. It is zero on the hyperplane H and positive on the full-dimensional region P . Thus it is positive on the open halfspace containing P . Hence, it must be negative on the open halfspace containing R and Q . We conclude that $g_{n(P)}^Q > g_r^Q$. Since $g_r^Q \geq g_{n(Q)}^Q$, $k = n(P)$ satisfies conditions of the lemma. □

Now we proceed with the proof of Theorem 4.1.

(a) For a given $P \in \mathcal{T}$ we define $S_P = \{i : g_i^P \geq g_{n(P)}^P\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $F_P(\mathbf{x})$ be a function defined on Γ by the equation

$$F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \bigwedge_{i \in S_P} g_i(\mathbf{x}).$$

Clearly, $F_P(\mathbf{x}) = g_{n(P)}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in P$.

Suppose $F_P(\mathbf{y}) < F_Q(\mathbf{y})$ for some $\mathbf{y} \in P$ and $Q \neq P$, i.e.,

$$\bigwedge_{i \in S_P} g_i(\mathbf{y}) < \bigwedge_{j \in S_Q} g_j(\mathbf{y}).$$

Then $g_{n(P)}^P < g_j^P$ for all $j \in S_Q$. Thus for any j such that $g_j^Q \geq g_{n(Q)}^Q$ we have $g_{n(P)}^P < g_j^P$. This contradicts Lemma 4.1.

Hence, $F_Q(\mathbf{x}) \leq F_P(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in P$ and $Q \in \mathcal{T}$.

Consider function $F(\mathbf{x})$ defined by

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{P \in \mathcal{T}} F_P(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{P \in \mathcal{T}} \bigwedge_{i \in S_P} g_i(\mathbf{x})$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma$. Clearly, $f(\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \cup \mathcal{T}$. Since $\cup \mathcal{T}$ is dense in Γ and f and F are continuous functions on Γ , we conclude that

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{P \in \mathcal{T}} \bigwedge_{i \in S_P} g_i(\mathbf{x})$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma$.

(b) Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ be a family of distinct linear functions on Γ and let f be defined by (1). Consider sets $H_{ij} = \{\mathbf{x} : g_i(\mathbf{x}) = g_j(\mathbf{x}), i > j\}$. If the intersections of these sets with $\text{int}(\Gamma)$ are empty, then the functions g_i 's are linearly ordered over $\text{int}(\Gamma)$ and, by (1), f is a linear function. Otherwise, let $\mathcal{H}$ be the family of sets H_{ij} 's with nonempty intersections with $\text{int}(\Gamma)$. Let Q be a region of the arrangement $\mathcal{H}$. Since Q is connected, the functions g_i 's are linearly ordered over Q and, by (1), there is i such that $f(\mathbf{x}) = g_i(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in Q$. The same is also true for the closure of Q .

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 4.1. *Let Γ be a star-like domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that its boundary $\partial\Gamma$ is a polyhedral complex. Let f be a function on $\partial\Gamma$ such that its restriction to each $(d-1)$ -dimensional polyhedron in $\partial\Gamma$ is a linear function on it. Then f admits representation (1).*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{a}$ be a central point in Γ . For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{a}$, let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ be the unique intersection point of the ray from $\mathbf{a}$ through $\mathbf{x}$ with $\partial\Gamma$. We define

$$\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{a}\|}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{a}\|} f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}), & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{a}, \\ 0, & \text{for } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\tilde{f}$ is a piecewise linear function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{f}|_{\partial\Gamma} = f$. Thus f admits representation (1). □

Note that the previous corollary holds for any polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

5 Concluding remarks

1. The statements of Theorem 4.1 also hold for piecewise linear functions from Γ to $\mathbb{R}^m$. Namely, let $\mathbf{f} : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a piecewise linear function and $\{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n\}$ be the set of its distinct components. We denote

$$\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_m) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{g}_k = (g_1^{(k)}, \dots, g_m^{(k)}), \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

There exists a family $\{S_j^k\}_{j \in J, 1 \leq k \leq n}$ of subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$f_k(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{j \in J} \bigwedge_{i \in S_j^k} g_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m.$$

The converse is also true.

2. The convexity of Γ is an essential assumption. Consider, for instance, the domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ which is a union of three triangles defined by the sets of their vertices as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &= \{(-1, 0), (-1, -1), (0, 0)\}, & \Delta_2 &= \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (1, 0)\}, \\ \text{and } \Delta_3 &= \{(-1, 0), (1, 0), (0, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} -x_2, & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_1, \\ x_2, & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_2 \cup \Delta_3, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$. This piecewise linear function has two components, $g_1(\mathbf{x}) = -x_2$ and $g_2(\mathbf{x}) = x_2$, but is not representable in the form (1).

3. Likewise, (1) is not true for piecewise polynomial functions as the following example (due to B. Sturmfels) illustrates. Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^1$. We define

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } x \leq 0, \\ x^2, & \text{for } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

4. It follows from Theorem 4.1 that any piecewise linear function on a closed convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be extended to a piecewise linear function on the entire space $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks S. Gelfand, O. Musin, and B. Sturmfels for helpful discussions on the earlier versions of the paper.

References

- [1] A. Björner, M. Las Vergnas, B. Sturmfels, N. White, and G.M. Ziegler, Oriented Matroids, Encyclopedia of Mathematics, Vol. 46, Cambridge University press, 1993.
- [2] B. Grünbaum, Convex Polytopes, Interscience, London, 1967.
- [3] G.M. Ziegler, Lectures on Polytopes, Graduate Text in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1995.